arXiv:1304.1637v1 [cs.DM] 5 Apr 2013

THE FREENESS PROBLEM OVER MATRIX SEMIGROUPS AND BOUNDED LANGUAGES

ÉMILIE CHARLIER AND JUHA HONKALA

Abstract. We study the freeness problem for matrix semigroups. We show that the freeness problem is decidable for upper-triangular 2×2 matrices with rational entries when the products are restricted to certain bounded languages.

1. Introduction

In this paper we study the freeness problem over matrix semigroups. In general, if S is a semigroup and X is a subset of S, we say that X is a code if for any integers $m, n \geq 1$ and any elements $x_1, \ldots, x_m, y_1, \ldots, y_n \in X$ the equation

$$x_1 x_2 \ldots x_m = y_1 y_2 \ldots y_n$$

implies that $m = n$ and $x_i = y_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq m$. The freeness problem over S consists of deciding whether or not a finite subset of S is a code.

The freeness problem over S can also be stated as follows. Suppose Σ is a finite nonempty alphabet and $\mu : \Sigma^+ \to S$ is a morphism. Then the freeness problem over S is to decide whether or not μ is injective.

For a general introduction to freeness problems over semigroups see [CN12].

An interesting special case of the freeness problem concerns freeness of matrix semigroups. Let R be a semiring and let $k \geq 1$ be an integer. Then the semiring of $k \times k$ matrices (resp. upper-triangular $k \times k$ matrices) is denoted by $R^{k\times k}$ (resp. $R^{k\times k}_{\text{uptr}}$). The sets $R^{k\times k}$ and $R^{k\times k}_{\text{uptr}}$ are monoids and the freeness problem over $R^{k\times k}$ is to decide whether or not a given morphism

$$\mu : \Sigma^* \to R^{k\times k}$$

is injective. Most cases of this problem are undecidable. In fact, Klarner, Birget and Satterfield [KBS91] proved that the freeness problem over $\mathbb{N}^{3\times 3}$ is undecidable. Cassaigne, Harju and Karhumäki [CHK99] improved this result by showing that the problem remains undecidable for $\mathbb{N}^{3\times 3}_{\text{uptr}}$. Both of these undecidability results use the Post correspondence problem. Cassaigne, Harju and Karhumäki also discuss the freeness problem for 2×2 matrices having rational entries. This problem is still open even for upper-triangular 2×2 matrices. For some special decidable cases of the freeness problem for 2×2 matrices see [CHK99] and [Hon09].

In this paper we discuss the problem whether or not a given morphism $\mu : \Sigma^* \to \mathbb{Q}^{\text{k}\times\text{k}}_{\text{uptr}}$ is injective on certain bounded languages. This approach is inspired by the well-known fact that many language theoretic problems which are undecidable in general become decidable when restricted to bounded languages. Our main result is that we can decide the injectivity of a given morphism $\mu : \{x, z_1, \ldots, z_{t+1}\}^* \to \mathbb{Q}^{2\times 2}_{\text{uptr}}$ on the language $L_t =$

$z_1x^*z_2x^*z_3\dots z_tx^*z_{t+1}$ for any $t \geq 1$, provided that the matrices $\mu(z_i)$ are nonsingular for $1 \leq i \leq t+1$. To prove this result we will study the representation of rational numbers in a rational base.

On the other hand, we will show that if we consider large enough matrices the injectivity problem becomes undecidable even if restricted to certain very special bounded languages. Hence, contrary to the common situation in language theory, the restriction of the freeness problem over bounded languages remains undecidable. The proof of our undecidability result will use a reduction to Hilbert's tenth problem in a way which is commonly used to obtain various undecidability results for rational power seris (see [KS86]) and which is also used in [BHH$^+$08] to study the mortality problem for products of matrices.

2. Results and examples

As usual, $\mathbb{Z}$ and $\mathbb{Q}$ are the sets of integers and rational numbers. If $k \geq 1$ is an integer, the set of $k \times k$ matrices having integer (resp. rational) entries is denoted by $\mathbb{Z}^{k\times k}$ (resp. $\mathbb{Q}^{k\times k}$) and the set of upper-triangular $k \times k$ matrices is denoted by $\mathbb{Z}^{\mathrm{k\times k}}_{\mathrm{uptr}}$ (resp. $\mathbb{Q}^{\mathrm{k\times k}}_{\mathrm{uptr}}$).

We will consider two special families of bounded languages. Suppose $t \geq 1$ is a positive integer. Let

$$\Sigma_t = \{x, z_1, \dots, z_{t+1}\}$$

be an alphabet having $t+2$ different letters and let

$$\Delta = \{x, y, z_1, z_2\}$$

be an alphabet having four different letters. Define the languages $L_t \subseteq \Sigma_t^*$ and $K_t \subseteq \Delta^*$ by

$$L_t = z_1x^*z_2x^*z_3\cdots z_tx^*z_{t+1}$$

and

$$K_t = z_1(x^*y)^{t-1}x^*z_2.$$

We can now state our results.

Theorem 1. *Let t be a positive integer. It is decidable whether or not a given morphism*

$$\mu\colon \Sigma_t^* \to \mathbb{Q}^{2\times 2}_{\mathrm{uptr}}$$

such that $\mu(z_i)$ is nonsingular for $i = 1, \dots, t+1$, is injective on L_t.

Theorem 2. *There exist two positive integers k and t such that there is no algorithm to decide whether a given morphism*

$$\mu\colon \Delta^* \to \mathbb{Z}^{k\times k}_{\mathrm{uptr}}$$

is injective on K_t.

We will continue with examples which illustrate the problem considered in Theorem 1. In the examples we assume that t is a positive integer,

$$\mu : \Sigma_t^* \to \mathbb{Q}^{2\times 2}_{\mathrm{uptr}}$$

is a morphism such that $\mu(z_i)$ is nonsingular for $i = 1, \ldots, t+1$. We denote

$$\mu(x) = M \text{ and } \mu(z_i) = N_i$$

for $i = 1, \ldots, t+1$.

Example 3. Assume that $t = 2$. Let $\mu(x) = \begin{pmatrix} 3 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$ and let $\mu(z_2) = \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 1 \\ 0 & 3 \end{pmatrix}$. Then

$$\mu(x^m z_2 x^n) = \begin{pmatrix} 2 \cdot 3^{m+n} & 3^m \\ 0 & 3 \end{pmatrix}$$

for all $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$. Hence μ is injective on L_2.

Example 4. Assume that $t = 1$. Let $M = c\begin{pmatrix} 1 & b \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$ where $b, c \in \mathbb{Q}$ and $c \neq 0$. Then

$$M^n = c^n \begin{pmatrix} 1 & nb \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

for all $n \geq 0$. It follows that there exist different integers $m, n \geq 0$ such that

$$M^m = M^n$$

if and only if $c \in \{-1, 1\}$ and $b = 0$. Hence μ is injective on L_1 if and only if $c \notin \{-1, 1\}$ or $b \neq 0$.

Example 5. Assume that $t = 2$ and let M be as in Example 4. Let

$$N_2 = \begin{pmatrix} A_2 & B_2 \\ 0 & C_2 \end{pmatrix}$$

where $A_2, B_2, C_2 \in \mathbb{Q}$. Then

$$M^m N_2 M^n = c^{m+n} \begin{pmatrix} A_2 & A_2 bn + B_2 + C_2 bm \\ 0 & C_2 \end{pmatrix}$$

for all $m, n \geq 0$. This implies that if $c \notin \{-1, 1\}$, then μ is injective if and only if $A_2 b \neq C_2 b$. If $c \in \{-1, 1\}$, then μ is not injective on L_2.

Example 6. Assume that $t \geq 3$. Let M and N_2 be as in Example 5 and let

$$N_3 = \begin{pmatrix} A_3 & B_3 \\ 0 & C_3 \end{pmatrix}$$

where $A_3, B_3, C_3 \in \mathbb{Q}$. Then we can find two different triples (m_1, m_2, m_3) and (n_1, n_2, n_3) of nonnegative integers such that

$$m_1 + m_2 + m_3 = n_1 + n_2 + n_3$$

and

$$C_2 C_3 m_1 + A_2 C_3 m_2 + A_2 A_3 m_3 = C_2 C_3 n_1 + A_2 C_3 n_2 + A_2 A_3 n_3.$$

This implies that

$$M^{m_1} N_2 M^{m_2} N_3 M^{m_3} = M^{n_1} N_2 M^{n_2} N_3 M^{n_3}$$

which shows that μ is not injective on L_t.

3. Proof of Theorem 1

3.1. **From matrices to representations of rational numbers.** For any $r \in \mathbb{Q}\setminus\{0\}$ and any word $w = w_{n-1}\cdots w_1 w_0$ (where the w_i's are any digits), we define the *value of w with respect to the base r* to be the number

$$\mathrm{val}_r(w) = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} w_i\, r^i.$$

For any number m, we introduce a corresponding letter denoted by $\overline{m}$ such that $\mathrm{val}_r(\overline{m}) = m$ holds for any base r.

The following lemma is straightforward.

Lemma 7. *Let $M = c\begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$ where $c, a, b \in \mathbb{Q}$. Then*

$$M^n = c^n \begin{pmatrix} a^n & \mathrm{val}_a(\overline{b}^{\,n}) \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

for any $n \geq 1$.

The following lemma shows that in order to prove Theorem 1 we can study representations of rational numbers in a rational base.

Lemma 8. *Let $s \geq 1$ be a positive integer, let $M = c\begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$ with $a, b, c \in \mathbb{Q}$ and, for $i = 1, \ldots, s+1$, let $N_i = \begin{pmatrix} A_i & B_i \\ 0 & C_i \end{pmatrix}$ with $A_i, B_i, C_i \in \mathbb{Q}$. Then we can compute rational numbers $q_1, \ldots, q_{s+1}, p_1, \ldots, p_s$ such that*

(1)

$$\begin{aligned} &N_1 M^{m_1} N_2 \cdots N_s M^{m_s} N_{s+1} \\ &\qquad = c^{m_1+\cdots+m_s} \begin{pmatrix} A_1\cdots A_{s+1} a^{m_1+\cdots+m_s} & \mathrm{val}_a(\overline{q_1}\,\overline{p_1}^{\,m_s-1}\,\overline{q_2}\cdots\overline{q_s}\,\overline{p_s}^{\,m_1-1}\,\overline{q_{s+1}}) \\ 0 & C_1\cdots C_{s+1} \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

for all positive integers $m_1, \ldots, m_s$.

Proof. We proceed by induction on s. Suppose first that $s = 1$. If $m_1 \geq 1$, Lemma 7 implies

$$\begin{aligned} N_1 M^{m_1} N_2 &= \begin{pmatrix} A_1 & B_1 \\ 0 & C_1 \end{pmatrix} c^{m_1} \begin{pmatrix} a^{m_1} & \mathrm{val}_a(\overline{b}^{\,m_1}) \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} A_2 & B_2 \\ 0 & C_2 \end{pmatrix} \\ &= c^{m_1} \begin{pmatrix} A_1 a^{m_1} & A_1\,\mathrm{val}_a(\overline{b}^{\,m_1}) + B_1 \\ 0 & C_1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} A_2 & B_2 \\ 0 & C_2 \end{pmatrix} \\ &= c^{m_1} \begin{pmatrix} A_1 A_2 a^{m_1} & A_1 B_2 a^{m_1} + A_1 C_2\,\mathrm{val}_a(\overline{b}^{\,m_1}) + B_1 C_2 \\ 0 & C_1 C_2 \end{pmatrix} \\ &= c^{m_1} \begin{pmatrix} A_1 A_2 a^{m_1} & \mathrm{val}_a\left(\overline{A_1 B_2}\,\overline{A_1 C_2 b}^{\,m_1-1}\,\overline{C_2(A_1 b + B_1)}\right) \\ 0 & C_1 C_2 \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

This implies the claim for $s = 1$.

Let then $s \geq 1$ and assume inductively that we have computed rational numbers $q_1, \dots, q_{s+1}, p_1, \dots, p_s$ such that (1) holds for all $m_1, \dots, m_s \geq 1$. Let $m_{s+1} \geq 1$ and let $N_{s+2} = \begin{pmatrix} A_{s+2} & B_{s+2} \\ 0 & C_{s+2} \end{pmatrix}$. For the sake of brevity, let us denote $d_1 = A_1 \cdots A_{s+1}$, $d_2 = C_1 \cdots C_{s+1}$ and $N_{s+2} = \begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ 0 & C \end{pmatrix}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} & N_1 M^{m_1} N_2 M^{m_2} N_3 \cdots N_{s+1} M^{m_{s+1}} N_{s+2} \\ = \;& c^{m_1+\cdots+m_s} \begin{pmatrix} d_1 a^{m_1+\cdots+m_s} & T \\ 0 & d_2 \end{pmatrix} c^{m_{s+1}} \begin{pmatrix} a^{m_{s+1}} & \operatorname{val}_a(\overline{b}^{m_{s+1}}) \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ 0 & C \end{pmatrix} \\ = \;& c^{m_1+\cdots+m_{s+1}} \begin{pmatrix} d_1 a^{m_1+\cdots+m_s} & T \\ 0 & d_2 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} A a^{m_{s+1}} & B a^{m_{s+1}} + C \operatorname{val}_a(\overline{b}^{m_{s+1}}) \\ 0 & C \end{pmatrix} \\ = \;& c^{m_1+\cdots+m_{s+1}} \begin{pmatrix} d_1 A a^{m_1+\cdots+m_{s+1}} & d_1 a^{m_1+\cdots+m_s}(B a^{m_{s+1}} + C \operatorname{val}_a(\overline{b}^{m_{s+1}})) + CT \\ 0 & d_2 C \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

where $T = \operatorname{val}_a(\overline{q_1}\, \overline{p_1}^{m_s-1}\, \overline{q_2} \cdots \overline{q_s}\, \overline{p_s}^{m_1-1}\, \overline{q_{s+1}})$. We compute $d_1 A = A_1 \cdots A_{s+2}$, $d_2 C = C_1 \cdots C_{s+2}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} & d_1 a^{m_1+\cdots+m_s}(B a^{m_{s+1}} + C \operatorname{val}_a(\overline{b}^{m_{s+1}})) + CT \\ & \quad = \operatorname{val}_a(\overline{d_1 B}\, \overline{d_1 C b}^{m_{s+1}-1}\, \overline{C(d_1 b + q_1)}\, \overline{C p_1}^{m_s-1}\, \overline{C q_2} \cdots \overline{C q_s}\, \overline{C p_s}^{m_1-1}\, \overline{C q_{s+1}}). \end{aligned}$$

This conclude the proof. □

3.2. **Comparison of the representations.** If Σ is an alphabet, we let $\hat{\Sigma}$ be the alphabet defined by

$$\hat{\Sigma} = \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} \sigma_1 \\ \sigma_2 \end{bmatrix} : \sigma_1, \sigma_2 \in \Sigma \right\}.$$

A word in $\hat{\Sigma}^*$ given by

$$\begin{bmatrix} \sigma_{i_1} \\ \sigma_{j_1} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \sigma_{i_2} \\ \sigma_{j_2} \end{bmatrix} \cdots \begin{bmatrix} \sigma_{i_\ell} \\ \sigma_{j_\ell} \end{bmatrix}$$

will be written as

$$\begin{bmatrix} \sigma_{i_1} \sigma_{i_2} \cdots \sigma_{i_\ell} \\ \sigma_{j_1} \sigma_{j_2} \cdots \sigma_{j_\ell} \end{bmatrix}.$$

In what follows it is important to observe that if we have a word $\begin{bmatrix} w_1 \\ w_2 \end{bmatrix}$ in $\hat{\Sigma}^*$ then necessarily the words w_1 and w_2 have equal lengths.

The next lemma shows that in comparing the representations of rational numbers we can use regular languages.

Lemma 9. *Let $S \subseteq \mathbb{Q}$ be a finite nonempty set, let $S_1 = \{\overline{s} \colon s \in S\}$ and let $X = \hat{S}_1$. Let $r \in \mathbb{Q} \setminus \{-1, 0, 1\}$. Then the language*

$$L = \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} w_1 \\ w_2 \end{bmatrix} \in X^* \colon \operatorname{val}_r(w_1) = \operatorname{val}_r(w_2) \right\}$$

is effectively regular.

Proof. First, observe that

$$\mathrm{val}_r(x_n\cdots x_1x_0)=\mathrm{val}_r(y_n\cdots y_1y_0)$$

holds if and only if

$$\mathrm{val}_{r^{-1}}(x_0x_1\cdots x_n)=\mathrm{val}_{r^{-1}}(y_0y_1\cdots y_n)$$

holds (here, the x_i's and y_i's are digits). Because the class of effectively regular languages is closed under reversal, we may assume $|r|>1$ without loss of generality.

Next, we assume without loss of generality that

$$S=\{-m+1,-m+2,\dots,-1,0,1,\dots,m-2,m-1\}$$

where m is a positive integer. In other words, we will assume that

$$X=\left\{\left[\begin{array}{c}\overline{a}\\ b\end{array}\right]: a,b\in\{-m+1,-m+2,\dots,-1,0,1,\dots,m-2,m-1\}\right\}.$$

Let $r=\frac{u}{v}$, where $u,v\in\mathbb{Z}$ do not have any nontrivial common factor. Let $d=\frac{2m-2}{|r|-1}$. We define the nondeterministic automaton $\mathcal{A}=(Q,X,\delta,\{q_0\},\{q_0\})$ as follows:

$$Q=\{q_i\colon i\in[-d,d]\cap\mathbb{Z}\}$$

and

$$\delta\big(q_i,\left[\begin{array}{c}\overline{a}\\ b\end{array}\right]\big)=\begin{cases} q_j, & \text{if } i+a-b=rj;\\ \emptyset, & \text{if } \frac{i+a-b}{r}\notin[-d,d]\cap\mathbb{Z}\,.\end{cases}$$

We will prove $L(\mathcal{A})=L^T$. (Here L^T is the reversal of L.)

Assume first that

$$\left[\begin{array}{c}\overline{a_0}\\ b_0\end{array}\right]\left[\begin{array}{c}\overline{a_1}\\ b_1\end{array}\right]\cdots\left[\begin{array}{c}\overline{a_n}\\ b_n\end{array}\right]\in L^T,$$

or, equivalently,

$$a_0+a_1r+\cdots+a_nr^n=b_0+b_1r+\cdots+b_nr^n. \tag{2}$$

We claim that there exist states $q_{\alpha_1},q_{\alpha_2},\dots,q_{\alpha_{n+1}}\in Q$ such that

$$\delta\big(q_0,\left[\begin{array}{c}\overline{a_0}\\ b_0\end{array}\right]\left[\begin{array}{c}\overline{a_1}\\ b_1\end{array}\right]\cdots\left[\begin{array}{c}\overline{a_i}\\ b_i\end{array}\right]\big)=q_{\alpha_{i+1}} \tag{3}$$

and

$$\alpha_{i+1}+a_{i+1}+\cdots+a_nr^{n-i-1}=b_{i+1}+\cdots+b_nr^{n-i-1} \tag{4}$$

hold for all $i=0,\dots,n$.

We first show the existence of q_{α_1}. Because (2) implies

$$a_0v^n+a_1uv^{n-1}+\cdots+a_nu^n=b_0v^n+b_1uv^{n-1}+\cdots+b_nu^n,$$

we have $a_0\equiv b_0 \bmod u$. Hence

$$\alpha_1=\frac{a_0-b_0}{r}=\frac{(a_0-b_0)v}{u}$$

is an integer. Because $|a_0|\le m-1$ and $|b_0|\le m-1$, we have

$$|\alpha_1|=\frac{|a_0-b_0|}{|r|}\le d,$$

and hence the state q_{α_1} exists.

Further, we have

$$\delta\big(q_0, \left[\begin{array}{c}\overline{a_0}\\ \overline{b_0}\end{array}\right]\big) = q_{\alpha_1}$$

and

$$\alpha_1 + a_1 + a_2 r + \cdots + a_n r^{n-1} = b_1 + b_2 r + \cdots + b_n r^{n-1}.$$

This proves the claim for $i = 0$.

Assume then $j \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$ and assume that there exist $q_{\alpha_1}, \ldots, q_{\alpha_j} \in Q$ such that (3) and (4) hold for $i = 0, \ldots, j-1$. From (4) it follows

$$\alpha_j + a_j \equiv b_j \bmod u.$$

Hence

$$\alpha_{j+1} = \frac{\alpha_j + a_j - b_j}{r} = \frac{(\alpha_j + a_j - b_j)v}{u}$$

is an integer. Because we have

$$|\alpha_{j+1}| = \frac{|\alpha_j + a_j - b_j|}{|r|} \leq \frac{|\alpha_j| + |a_j - b_j|}{|r|} \leq \frac{d + 2m - 2}{|r|} = \frac{d + d(|r| - 1)}{|r|} = d,$$

the state $q_{\alpha_{j+1}}$ exists. Further, we have

$$\delta\big(q_0, \left[\begin{array}{c}\overline{a_0}\\ \overline{b_0}\end{array}\right]\left[\begin{array}{c}\overline{a_1}\\ \overline{b_1}\end{array}\right]\cdots\left[\begin{array}{c}\overline{a_j}\\ \overline{b_j}\end{array}\right]\big) = \delta\big(q_{\alpha_j}, \left[\begin{array}{c}\overline{a_j}\\ \overline{b_j}\end{array}\right]\big) = q_{\alpha_{j+1}}$$

and

$$\alpha_{j+1} + a_{j+1} + a_{j+2} r + \cdots + a_n r^{n-j-1} = b_{j+1} + b_{j+2} r + \cdots + b_n r^{n-j-1}.$$

This concludes the proof of the claim.

From the claim it follows

$$\delta\big(q_0, \left[\begin{array}{c}\overline{a_0}\\ \overline{b_0}\end{array}\right]\left[\begin{array}{c}\overline{a_1}\\ \overline{b_1}\end{array}\right]\cdots\left[\begin{array}{c}\overline{a_n}\\ \overline{b_n}\end{array}\right]\big) = q_{\alpha_{n+1}}$$

and

$$\alpha_{n+1} = 0.$$

Therefore

$$\left[\begin{array}{c}\overline{a_0}\\ \overline{b_0}\end{array}\right]\left[\begin{array}{c}\overline{a_1}\\ \overline{b_1}\end{array}\right]\cdots\left[\begin{array}{c}\overline{a_n}\\ \overline{b_n}\end{array}\right] \in L(\mathcal{A}).$$

Hence $L^T \subseteq L(\mathcal{A})$.

Suppose now that

$$\left[\begin{array}{c}\overline{a_0}\\ \overline{b_0}\end{array}\right]\left[\begin{array}{c}\overline{a_1}\\ \overline{b_1}\end{array}\right]\cdots\left[\begin{array}{c}\overline{a_n}\\ \overline{b_n}\end{array}\right] \in L(\mathcal{A}).$$

Then there exist states $q_{\alpha_0}, q_{\alpha_1}, \ldots, q_{\alpha_{n+1}} \in Q$ such that

$$\delta\big(q_{\alpha_i}, \left[\begin{array}{c}\overline{a_i}\\ \overline{b_i}\end{array}\right]\big) = q_{\alpha_{i+1}}$$

for $i = 0, \ldots, n$ and $\alpha_0 = \alpha_{n+1} = 0$. By the definition of $\mathcal{A}$ we have

$$\alpha_i + a_i - b_i = r\alpha_{i+1}$$

for $i = 0, \dots, n$. This implies

$$a_0 + a_1 r + \cdots + a_n r^n = b_0 + b_1 r + \cdots + b_n r^n.$$

Hence

$$\left[\begin{array}{c} \overline{a_0} \\ \overline{b_0} \end{array}\right] \left[\begin{array}{c} \overline{a_1} \\ \overline{b_1} \end{array}\right] \cdots \left[\begin{array}{c} \overline{a_n} \\ \overline{b_n} \end{array}\right] \in L^T.$$

Therefore $L(\mathcal{A}) \subseteq L^T$. □

3.3. **A decidability method for Theorem 1.** We are now ready for the proof of Theorem 1.

Let t be a positive integer and assume that

$$\mu\colon \Sigma_t^* \to \mathbb{Q}_{\text{uptr}}^{2\times 2}$$

is a morphism such that $\mu(z_i)$ is nonsingular for $i = 1, \dots, t+1$.

First, we consider the particular case where $\mu(x)$ is singular. Suppose $\mu(x) = \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$, the case $\mu(x) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & b \\ 0 & c \end{pmatrix}$ being symmetric. Then $\mu(x^n) = a^{n-1}\mu(x)$ for all $n \geq 1$. If $t = 1$, then μ in injective on L_1 if and only if $a \notin \{-1, 0, 1\}$. If $t \geq 2$, then the equation $\mu(x^2 z_2 x) = \mu(x z_2 x^2)$ implies that μ is not injective on L_t.

For the rest of the proof we suppose that $\mu(x)$ is not singular. Let

$$\mu(x) = M = c\begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

and, for $i = 1, \dots, t+1$, let

$$\mu(z_i) = N_i = \begin{pmatrix} A_i & B_i \\ 0 & C_i \end{pmatrix},$$

where $a, b, c, A_i, B_i, C_i \in \mathbb{Q}$ for $i = 1, \dots, t+1$. Because M and N_i are nonsingular, a, c, A_i, C_i are nonzero for $i = 1, \dots, t+1$.

If $a = -1$, then $M^2 = c^2 I$. If $t \geq 2$, then μ is not injective on L_t because we have $N_1 M^2 N_2 = N_1 N_2 M^2$. If $t = 1$ and $c \in \{-1, 1\}$, then μ is not injective on L_t because $N_1 N_2 = N_1 M^2 N_2$. If $t = 1$ and $c \notin \{-1, 1\}$, it follows from the equation $\det(M^n) = (-c)^n$ that μ is injective on L_t.

For the rest of the proof we suppose in addition that $a \neq -1$. We suppose also that $a \neq 1$. In fact, we have already proved Theorem 1 if $a = 1$ in Examples 4, 5 and 6.

For each subset $K \subseteq \{1, \dots, t\}$, let

$$L_t(K) = \{z_1 x^{m_1} z_2 x^{m_2} z_3 \cdots z_t x^{m_t} z_{t+1} \colon m_i = 0 \text{ for } i \in K,\ m_i \geq 1 \text{ for } i \notin K\}.$$

Now L_t is a disjoint union of the languages $L_t(K)$ where K runs over all the subsets of $\{1, \dots, t\}$. Hence the morphism μ is injective on L_t if and only if

(i) for each $K \subseteq \{1, \dots, t\}$, μ is injective on $L_t(K)$; and
(ii) if $K_1, K_2 \subseteq \{1, \dots, t\}$ with $K_1 \neq K_2$, then there does not exist two words $w_1 \in L_t(K_1)$ and $w_2 \in L_t(K_2)$ such that $\mu(w_1) = \mu(w_2)$.

We first prove that (ii) is decidable. For $w_1 \in L_t(K_1)$ and $w_2 \in L_t(K_2)$, we have

$$\mu(w_1) = N_1' M^{k_1} N_2' M^{k_2} N_3' \cdots N_{s_1}' M^{k_{s_1}} N_{s_1+1}'$$

and

$$\mu(w_2) = N_1'' M^{\ell_1} N_2'' M^{\ell_2} N_3'' \cdots N_{s_2}'' M^{\ell_{s_2}} N_{s_2+1}''$$

where $s_1 = t - |K_1|$, $s_2 = t - |K_2|$, $k_i \geq 1$ for $i = 1, \ldots, s_1$, $\ell_j \geq 1$ for $j = 1, \ldots, s_2$ and

$$N_1 N_2 \cdots N_{t+1} = N_1' N_2' \cdots N_{s_1+1}' = N_1'' N_2'' \cdots N_{s_2+1}''.$$

In view of Lemma 8, deciding (ii) is equivalent to deciding the following two problems:

A : Given positive integers s_1, s_2 and rational numbers $p_1, \ldots, p_{s_1}$, $q_1, \ldots, q_{s_1+1}$, $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_{s_2}$, $\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_{s_2+1}$, decide whether there exist positive integers $k_1, \ldots, k_{s_1}$, $\ell_1, \ldots, \ell_{s_2}$ such that the two matrices

$$c^{k_1+\cdots+k_{s_1}} \begin{pmatrix} A_1 \cdots A_{t+1} a^{k_1+\cdots+k_{s_1}} & \mathrm{val}_a(\overline{q_1}\,\overline{p_1}^{k_{s_1}-1}\,\overline{q_2} \cdots \overline{q_{s_1}}\,\overline{p_{s_1}}^{k_1-1}\,\overline{q_{s_1+1}}) \\ 0 & C_1 \cdots C_{t+1} \end{pmatrix} \tag{5}$$

and

$$c^{\ell_1+\cdots+\ell_{s_2}} \begin{pmatrix} A_1 \cdots A_{t+1} a^{\ell_1+\cdots+\ell_{s_2}} & \mathrm{val}_a(\overline{\beta_1}\,\overline{\alpha_1}^{\ell_{s_2}-1}\,\overline{\beta_2} \cdots \overline{\beta_{s_2}}\,\overline{\alpha_{s_2}}^{\ell_1-1}\,\overline{\beta_{s_2+1}}) \\ 0 & C_1 \cdots C_{t+1} \end{pmatrix} \tag{6}$$

are equal.

B : Given a positive integer s and rational numbers $q, p_1, \ldots, p_s, q_1, \ldots, q_{s+1}$, decide whether there exist positive integers $k_1, \ldots, k_s$ such that the two matrices

$$c^{k_1+\cdots+k_s} \begin{pmatrix} A_1 \cdots A_{t+1} a^{k_1+\cdots+k_s} & \mathrm{val}_a(\overline{q_1}\,\overline{p_1}^{k_s-1}\overline{q_2} \cdots \overline{q_s}\,\overline{p_s}^{k_1-1}\,\overline{q_{s+1}}) \\ 0 & C_1 \cdots C_{t+1} \end{pmatrix} \tag{7}$$

and

$$\begin{pmatrix} A_1 \cdots A_{t+1} & q \\ 0 & C_1 \cdots C_{t+1} \end{pmatrix} \tag{8}$$

are equal.

Problem B corresponds to the case where one of the subsets K_1 and K_2 is equal to $\{1, \ldots, t\}$. Because the products ac, $A_1 \cdots A_{t+1}$ and $C_1 \cdots C_{t+1}$ are nonzero, a necessary condition for the equality of (7) and (8) is

$$a^{k_1+\cdots+k_s} = 1.$$

Because $a \notin \{-1, 1\}$ this condition never holds and Problem B has no solutions.

We now turn to Problem A. Because the products ac, $A_1 \cdots A_{t+1}$ and $C_1 \cdots C_{t+1}$ are nonzero, (5) and (6) are equal if and only if

$$a^{k_1+\cdots+k_{s_1}} = a^{\ell_1+\cdots+\ell_{s_2}}, \tag{9}$$

$$c^{k_1+\cdots+k_{s_1}} = c^{\ell_1+\cdots+\ell_{s_2}} \tag{10}$$

and

$$\mathrm{val}_a(\overline{q_1}\,\overline{p_1}^{k_{s_1}-1}\,\overline{q_2} \cdots \overline{q_{s_1}}\,\overline{p_{s_1}}^{k_1-1}\,\overline{q_{s_1+1}}) = \mathrm{val}_a(\overline{\beta_1}\,\overline{\alpha_1}^{\ell_{s_2}-1}\,\overline{\beta_2} \cdots \overline{\beta_{s_2}}\,\overline{\alpha_{s_2}}^{\ell_1-1}\,\overline{\beta_{s_2+1}}). \tag{11}$$

Because $a \notin \{-1, 0, 1\}$ (9) and (10) hold if and only if

$$k_1 + \cdots + k_{s_1} = \ell_1 + \cdots + \ell_{s_2}. \tag{12}$$

Let now $S = \{q_1, \ldots, q_{s_1+1}, p_1, \ldots, p_{s_1}, \beta_1, \ldots, \beta_{s_2+1}, \alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_{s_2}\}$, let $S_1 = \{\overline{s} \colon s \in S\}$ and let $X = \hat{S_1}$. Let

$$L = \left\{ \left[\begin{array}{c} u_1 \\ u_2 \end{array} \right] \in X^* \colon \operatorname{val}_a(u_1) = \operatorname{val}_a(u_2) \right\}$$

and let

$$T_1 = \left\{ \left[\begin{array}{c} u_1 \\ u_2 \end{array} \right] \in X^* \colon u_1 \in \overline{q_1}\,\overline{p_1}^*\,\overline{q_2} \cdots \overline{q_{s_1}}\,\overline{p_{s_1}}^*\,\overline{q_{s_1+1}},\ u_2 \in \overline{\beta_1}\,\overline{\alpha_1}^*\,\overline{\beta_2} \cdots \overline{\beta_{s_2}}\,\overline{\alpha_{s_2}}^*\,\overline{\beta_{s_2+1}} \right\}.$$

By Lemma 9, L is effectively regular. So is clearly T_1. In fact, it is easy to construct a finite automaton which accepts T_1. Now we can decide (ii) by checking whether or not

$$L \cap T_1 = \emptyset.$$

Indeed, suppose a word $\left[\begin{array}{c} u_1 \\ u_2 \end{array} \right] \in X^*$ belongs to $L \cap T_1$. Then there exist positive integers $k_1, \ldots, k_{s_1}, \ell_1, \ldots, \ell_{s_2}$ such that

$$u_1 = \overline{q_1}\,\overline{p_1}^{k_{s_1}-1}\,\overline{q_2} \cdots \overline{q_{s_1}}\,\overline{p_{s_1}}^{k_1-1}\,\overline{q_{s_1+1}}$$

and

$$u_2 = \overline{\beta_1}\,\overline{\alpha_1}^{\ell_{s_2}-1}\,\overline{\beta_2} \cdots \overline{\beta_{s_2}}\,\overline{\alpha_{s_2}}^{\ell_1-1}\,\overline{\beta_{s_2+1}}.$$

Because $\left[\begin{array}{c} u_1 \\ u_2 \end{array} \right] \in L \cap T_1$, we have $\operatorname{val}_a(u_1) = \operatorname{val}_a(u_2)$ and $|u_1| = |u_2|$. The latter condition means that

$$k_{s_1} + \cdots + k_1 + 1 = \ell_{s_2} + \cdots + \ell_1 + 1$$

which gives (12). Hence (5) and (6) are equal. Conversely, if there exist positive integers $k_1, \ldots, k_{s_1}, \ell_1, \ldots, \ell_{s_2}$ such that the matrices (5) and (6) are equal, then

$$\left[\begin{array}{c} \overline{q_1}\,\overline{p_1}^{k_{s_1}-1}\,\overline{q_2} \cdots \overline{q_{s_1}}\,\overline{p_{s_1}}^{k_1-1}\,\overline{q_{s_1+1}} \\ \overline{\beta_1}\,\overline{\alpha_1}^{\ell_{s_2}-1}\,\overline{\beta_2} \cdots \overline{\beta_{s_2}}\,\overline{\alpha_{s_2}}^{\ell_1-1}\,\overline{\beta_{s_2+1}} \end{array} \right] \in L \cap T_1.$$

To conclude the proof of Theorem 1 it remains to prove that also (i) is decidable. We have to decide a variant of Problem A where $s_1 = s_2$, $p_i = \alpha_i$ and $q_j = \beta_j$ for $1 \leq i \leq s_1$, $1 \leq j \leq s_1 + 1$ and we have to find out whether there exist two different s_1-tuples $(k_1, \ldots, k_{s_1})$ and $(\ell_1, \ldots, \ell_{s_1})$ of positive integers such that (11) and (12) hold. Before we can proceed as we did above in case (ii) we have to check whether there exist different s_1-tuples $(k_1, \ldots, k_{s_1})$ and $(\ell_1, \ldots, \ell_{s_1})$ of positive integers such that

$$\overline{q_1}\,\overline{p_1}^{k_{s_1}-1}\,\overline{q_2} \cdots \overline{q_{s_1}}\,\overline{p_{s_1}}^{k_1-1}\,\overline{q_{s_1+1}} = \overline{q_1}\,\overline{p_1}^{\ell_{s_1}-1}\,\overline{q_2} \cdots \overline{q_{s_1}}\,\overline{p_{s_1}}^{\ell_1-1}\,\overline{q_{s_1+1}}.$$

Observe that such s_1-tuples may exist, for example, they do exist if $p_1 = q_2 = p_2$. However, it is easy to decide whether there are such s_1-tuples. If there are, μ is not injective on $L_t(K)$. We continue with the assumption that such s_1-tuples do not exist.

Then we can decide (i) proceeding as we did above. The only difference is that we replace T_1 by

$$T_2 = \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} u_1 \\ u_2 \end{bmatrix} \in T_1 \colon u_1 \neq u_2 \right\}.$$

This is done because we do not want T_2 to include words $\begin{bmatrix} u_1 \\ u_2 \end{bmatrix}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} u_1 &= \overline{q_1}\,\overline{p_1}^{k_{s_1}-1}\,\overline{q_2}\cdots\overline{q_{s_1}}\,\overline{p_{s_1}}^{k_1-1}\,\overline{q_{s_1+1}}, \\ u_2 &= \overline{q_1}\,\overline{p_1}^{\ell_{s_1}-1}\,\overline{q_2}\cdots\overline{q_{s_1}}\,\overline{p_{s_1}}^{\ell_1-1}\,\overline{q_{s_1+1}} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$(k_1, \ldots, k_{s_1}) = (\ell_1, \ldots, \ell_{s_1}).$$

Observe that we did not have this problem in case (ii) because there the languages $L_t(K_1)$ and $L_t(K_2)$ were disjoint.

4. Proof of Theorem 2

Let us fix some notation first. If $A_1, A_2, \ldots, A_s$ are matrices, then their *direct sum* $A_1 \oplus A_2 \oplus \cdots \oplus A_s$ is

$$\begin{pmatrix} A_1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & A_2 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & A_s \end{pmatrix}.$$

If $A = (a_{ij})_{m\times n}$ and B are matrices, then their *Kronecker product* $A \otimes B$ is

$$\begin{pmatrix} a_{11}B & a_{12}B & \cdots & a_{1m}B \\ a_{21}B & a_{22}B & \cdots & a_{2m}B \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ a_{m1}B & a_{m2}B & \cdots & a_{mn}B \end{pmatrix}.$$

In both cases, we have used block notation.

The direct sum and the Kronecker product have the following properties: if $A_1, A_2, \ldots, A_s$ are $m \times m$ matrices and $B_1, B_2, \ldots, B_s$ are $n \times n$ matrices, then

$$(A_1 \oplus B_1)(A_2 \oplus B_2)\cdots(A_s \oplus B_s) = (A_1A_2\cdots A_s) \oplus (B_1B_2\cdots B_s)$$

and

$$(A_1 \otimes B_1)(A_2 \otimes B_2)\cdots(A_s \otimes B_s) = (A_1A_2\cdots A_s) \otimes (B_1B_2\cdots B_s).$$

For more details on the Kronecker product, see for example [LT85, Chapter 12] or [KS86].

If k is a positive integer, then $E_k = (e_{ij})_{k\times k}$ is the $k \times k$ matrix whose only nonzero entry is $e_{1k} = 1$.

The main idea of our proof of Theorem 2 is to use the undecidability of Hilbert's tenth problem combined with the following result. Suppose that t is a positive integer and that $p(x_1,\dots,x_t)$ is a polynomial with integer coefficients. We want to find a positive integer k and matrices $A,M,N,B\in\mathbb{Z}_{\mathrm{uptr}}^{\mathrm{k}\times\mathrm{k}}$ such that

$$AM^{a_1}NM^{a_2}N\cdots NM^{a_t}B=p(a_1,\dots,a_t)E_k$$

for all nonnegative integers $a_1,\dots,a_t$.

Fix the value of t.

Lemma 10. *Let $i\in\{1,\dots,t\}$. Then there exists a positive integer k and matrices $A,M,N,B\in\mathbb{Z}_{\mathrm{uptr}}^{\mathrm{k}\times\mathrm{k}}$ such that*

$$AM^{a_1}NM^{a_2}N\cdots NM^{a_t}B=a_iE_k$$

for all nonnegative integers $a_1,\dots,a_t$.

Proof. Let $k=2t$,

$$A=\begin{pmatrix}1&0&\cdots&0\\0&0&\cdots&0\\\vdots&\vdots&&\vdots\\0&0&\cdots&0\end{pmatrix}\text{ and }B=\begin{pmatrix}0&\cdots&0&0\\0&\cdots&0&0\\\vdots&&\vdots&\vdots\\0&\cdots&0&1\end{pmatrix},$$

where $A,B\in\mathbb{Z}_{\mathrm{uptr}}^{\mathrm{k}\times\mathrm{k}}$. Let $E=\begin{pmatrix}1&1\\0&1\end{pmatrix}$ and $I=\begin{pmatrix}1&0\\0&1\end{pmatrix}$. Let

$$M=I\oplus\cdots\oplus I\oplus E\oplus I\oplus\cdots\oplus I,$$

where there are t summands of which E is the ith one, and let

$$N=\begin{pmatrix}0&I&0&\cdots&0\\0&0&I&\cdots&0\\\vdots&\vdots&\vdots&&\vdots\\0&0&0&\cdots&I\\0&0&0&\cdots&0\end{pmatrix}$$

be a $k\times k$ matrix where each 0 stands for the 2×2 zero matrix.

Then $A,M,N,B\in\mathbb{Z}_{\mathrm{uptr}}^{\mathrm{k}\times\mathrm{k}}$ and we have

$$\begin{aligned}M^n&=I\oplus\cdots\oplus I\oplus E^n\oplus I\oplus\cdots\oplus I\\&=I\oplus\cdots\oplus I\oplus\begin{pmatrix}1&n\\0&1\end{pmatrix}\oplus I\oplus\cdots\oplus I\end{aligned}$$

for all $n\in\mathbb{N}$.

Now, if D is any matrix in $\mathbb{Z}_{\mathrm{uptr}}^{\mathrm{k}\times\mathrm{k}}$ then the only nonzero entry of ADB is the last entry in the first row, which is equal to D_{1k}. Let us compute this entry for

$$AM^{a_1}NM^{a_2}N\cdots NM^{a_t}B$$

where $a_1, \ldots, a_t$ are nonnegative integers. For this, we regard M and N as $t \times t$ matrices consisting of 2×2 blocks:

$$\begin{aligned}
&(M^{a_1} N M^{a_2} N \cdots N M^{a_t})_{1t} \\
&\qquad = (M^{a_1})_{11} N_{12} (M^{a_2})_{22} N_{23} \cdots N_{i-1,i} (M^{a_i})_{ii} N_{i,i+1} \cdots N_{t-1,t} (M^{a_t})_{tt} \\
&\qquad = I \cdot I \cdot I \cdots I \cdot \begin{pmatrix} 1 & a_i \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \cdot I \cdots I \\
&\qquad = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & a_i \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.
\end{aligned}$$

The results follows. □

Lemma 11. *Let $p_1(x_1, \ldots, x_t)$ and $p_2(x_1, \ldots, x_t)$ be polynomials with integer coefficients. Suppose there exist $s_1, s_2 \geq 1$, $A_1, M_1, N_1, B_1 \in \mathbb{Z}_{\mathrm{uptr}}^{s_1 \times s_1}$ and $A_2, M_2, N_2, B_2 \in \mathbb{Z}_{\mathrm{uptr}}^{s_2 \times s_2}$ such that*

$$A_1 M_1^{a_1} N_1 M_1^{a_2} N_1 \cdots N_1 M_1^{a_t} B_1 = p_1(a_1, \ldots, a_t) E_{s_1}$$

and

$$A_2 M_2^{a_1} N_2 M_2^{a_2} N_2 \cdots N_2 M_2^{a_t} B_2 = p_2(a_1, \ldots, a_t) E_{s_2}$$

for all $a_1, \ldots, a_t \in \mathbb{N}$. Then

(i) *there exist $s_3 \geq 1$ and $A_3, M_3, N_3, B_3 \in \mathbb{Z}_{\mathrm{uptr}}^{s_3 \times s_3}$ such that*

$$A_3 M_3^{a_1} N_3 M_3^{a_2} N_3 \cdots N_3 M_3^{a_t} B_3 = (p_1 + p_2)(a_1, \ldots, a_t) E_{s_3}$$

for all $a_1, \ldots, a_t \in \mathbb{N}$;

(ii) *there exist $s_4 \geq 1$ and $A_4, M_4, N_4, B_4 \in \mathbb{Z}_{\mathrm{uptr}}^{s_4 \times s_4}$ such that*

$$A_4 M_4^{a_1} N_4 M_4^{a_2} N_4 \cdots N_4 M_4^{a_t} B_4 = (p_1 \cdot p_2)(a_1, \ldots, a_t) E_{s_4}$$

for all $a_1, \ldots, a_t \in \mathbb{N}$;

(iii) *if $c \in \mathbb{Z}$, then there exists $A_5 \in \mathbb{Z}_{\mathrm{uptr}}^{s_1 \times s_1}$ such that*

$$A_5 M_1^{a_1} N_1 M_1^{a_2} N_1 \cdots N_1 M_1^{a_t} B_1 = c \cdot p_1(a_1, \ldots, a_t) E_{s_1}$$

for all $a_1, \ldots, a_t \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proof. To prove (i) we take $M_3 = M_1 \oplus M_2$, $N_3 = N_1 \oplus N_2$,

$$A_3 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & \cdots & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \end{pmatrix} \cdot (A_1 \oplus A_2)$$

and

$$B_3 = (B_1 \oplus B_2) \cdot \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \cdots & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & 1 \\ \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

To prove (ii) we take $A_4 = A_1 \otimes A_2$, $M_4 = M_1 \otimes M_2$, $N_4 = N_1 \otimes N_2$ and $B_4 = B_1 \otimes B_2$. To prove (iii) it suffices to take $A_5 = cA_1$. Then the claims follow by simple computations which are left to the reader. □

Now our goal is achieved and we can state the following lemma.

Lemma 12. *Let t be any positive integer and $p(x_1, \ldots, x_t)$ be any polynomial with integer coefficients. Then there effectively exists a positive integer k and matrices $A, M, N, B \in \mathbb{Z}_{\mathrm{uptr}}^{\mathrm{k}\times\mathrm{k}}$ such that*

$$AM^{a_1}NM^{a_2}N\cdots NM^{a_t}B = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \cdots & 0 & p(a_1, \ldots, a_t) \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

for all $a_1, \ldots, a_t \in \mathbb{N}$.

Remark 13. Lemma 12 is closely related to the well-known fact stating that if $p(x_1, \ldots, x_t)$ is a polynomial having integer coefficients, then the series

$$\sum_{n_1,\ldots,n_t \geq 0} p(n_1, \ldots, n_t)\ x^{n_1}yx^{n_2}y\cdots yx^{n_t}$$

is $\mathbb{Z}$-rational; see for example [SS78]. The purpose of Lemma 12 is to show explicitly that we can get this result using only upper-triangular matrices.

We will use a strong version of the undecidability of Hilbert's tenth problem as stated in the following theorem (see Theorem 3.20 in [RS94].

Theorem 14. *There is a polynomial $P(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_m)$ with integer coefficients such that no algorithm exists for deciding whether an arbitrary equation of the form*

$$P(a, x_2, \ldots, x_m) = 0,$$

where a is a positive integer, has nonnegative integers $x_2, \ldots, x_m$ as a solution.

For $k = 2, 3, \ldots$, define the Cantor's polynomials $C_2, C_3, \ldots$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} C_2(x_1, x_2) &= \frac{1}{2}(x_1 + x_2)(x_1 + x_2 + 1) + x_2, \\ C_{k+1}(x_1, \ldots, x_{k+1}) &= C_2(C_k(x_1, \ldots, x_k), x_{k+1}). \end{aligned}$$

These polynomials are injective on $\mathbb{N}^k$. In other words, for all nonnegative integers $n_1, \ldots, n_k, m_1 \ldots, m_k$, if $C_k(n_1, \ldots, n_k) = C_k(m_1, \ldots, m_k)$ then $n_1 = m_1, \ldots, n_k = m_k$. Note that the C_k's are not injective on $\mathbb{Z}^k$.

Let $P(x_1, \ldots, x_m)$ be as in Theorem 14. Take a new indeterminate x_{m+1} and define the polynomial $Q(x_1, \ldots, x_m, x_{m+1})$ by

$$Q(x_1, \ldots, x_m, x_{m+1}) = e \cdot C_{m+1}(x_1, \ldots, x_m, P(x_1, \ldots, x_m)^2 \cdot x_{m+1}),$$

where e is a positive integer chosen such that Q has integer coefficients.

Lemma 15. *Let a be a positive integer. Then the equation $P(a, x_2, \ldots, x_m) = 0$ has a solution in nonnegative integers if and only if there exist nonnegative integers $b_2, \ldots, b_{m+1}, c_2, \ldots, c_{m+1}$ such that*

$$Q(a, b_2, \ldots, b_{m+1}) = Q(a, c_2, \ldots, c_{m+1}) \tag{13}$$

and

$$(b_2, \ldots, b_{m+1}) \neq (c_2, \ldots, c_{m+1}). \tag{14}$$

Proof. Suppose first that there exist $d_2, \ldots, d_m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$P(a, d_2, \ldots, d_m) = 0.$$

Then we have

$$Q(a, d_2, \ldots, d_m, x) = e \cdot C_{m+1}(a, d_2, \ldots, d_m, 0)$$

for any $x \in \mathbb{N}$. Hence, if we choose

$$(b_2, \ldots, b_{m+1}) = (d_2, \ldots, d_m, 1) \text{ and } (c_2, \ldots, c_{m+1}) = (d_2, \ldots, d_m, 2),$$

then (13) and (14) hold.

Suppose then that $P(a, d_2, \ldots, d_m) \neq 0$ for all $d_2, \ldots, d_m \in \mathbb{N}$. Suppose that

$$Q(a, b_2, \ldots, b_{m+1}) = Q(a, c_2, \ldots, c_{m+1})$$

where $b_2, \ldots, b_{m+1}, c_2, \ldots, c_{m+1} \in \mathbb{N}$. Hence

$$C_{m+1}(a, b_2, \ldots, b_m, P(a, b_2, \ldots, b_m)^2 b_{m+1}) = C_{m+1}(a, c_2, \ldots, c_m, P(a, c_2, \ldots, c_m)^2 c_{m+1}).$$

Because C_{m+1} is injective on $\mathbb{N}^{m+1}$ we obtain

$$b_2 = c_2, \ldots, b_m = c_m \tag{15}$$

and

$$P(a, b_2, \ldots, b_m)^2 b_{m+1} = P(a, c_2, \ldots, c_m)^2 c_{m+1}.$$

Using (15) and the assumption

$$P(a, b_2, \ldots, b_m) = P(a, c_2, \ldots, c_m) \neq 0,$$

we obtain $b_{m+1} = c_{m+1}$. Consequently, if $P(a, x_2, \ldots, x_m) = 0$ does not have a solution in nonnegative integers, then there does not exist $b_2, \ldots, b_{m+1}, c_2, \ldots, c_{m+1} \in \mathbb{N}$ such that (13) and (14) hold. □

We are now ready for the proof of Theorem 2.

Let $P(x_1, \ldots, x_m)$ and $Q(x_1, \ldots, x_{m+1})$ be as above. By Lemma 12 there is a positive integer k and a morphism $\mu\colon \Delta^* \to \mathbb{Z}_{\mathrm{uptr}}^{\mathrm{k \times k}}$ such that

$$\mu(z_1 x^{a_1} y x^{a_2} y \cdots y x^{a_{m+1}} z_2) = Q(a_1, \ldots, a_{m+1}) E_k$$

for all $a_1, \ldots, a_{m+1} \in \mathbb{N}$. For each $a \in \mathbb{N}$ define the morphism $\mu_a\colon \Delta^* \to \mathbb{Z}_{\mathrm{uptr}}^{\mathrm{k \times k}}$ by

$$\mu_a(z_1) = \mu(z_1 x^a y),\ \mu_a(x) = \mu(x),\ \mu_a(y) = \mu(y) \text{ and } \mu_a(z_2) = \mu(z_2).$$

Then

$$\mu_a(z_1 x^{a_2} y \cdots y x^{a_{m+1}} z_2) = Q(a, a_2, \ldots, a_{m+1}) E_k$$

for any $a \geq 1$ and $a_2, \ldots, a_{m+1} \in \mathbb{N}$. By Lemma 15, for any $a \geq 1$, the morphism μ_a is injective on K_m if and only if the equation $P(a, x_2 \ldots, x_m) = 0$ does not have a solution in nonnegative integers. Now Theorem 2 follows by Theorem 14.

5. Concluding remarks

In the proof of our undecidability result we used singular matrices. On the other hand, in Theorem 1 we require that $\mu(z_i)$ is nonsingular for $i = 1, \ldots, t+1$. This assumption plays an essential role in our proof of the theorem. At present we do not know how to avoid using this assumption.

The following examples illustrate the situations where some of the matrices $\mu(z_i)$, $1 \leq i \leq t+1$, are singular. The first two examples show that the singularity of some $\mu(z_i)$ often implies that μ is not injective while the third example shows that this is not always the case. In these examples we use the notations of Section 3.

Example 16. Let $t \geq 2$ and assume that there is an integer i, $1 \leq i \leq t-1$, such that N_i is of the form $\begin{pmatrix} 0 & B \\ 0 & C \end{pmatrix}$, where $B, C \in \mathbb{Q}$. Then

$$N_i M N_{i+1} = N_i N_{i+1} M,$$

which implies that μ is not injective on L_t.

Example 17. Let $t \geq 2$ and assume that there is an integer i, $3 \leq i \leq t+1$, such that N_i is of the form $\begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$, where $A, B \in \mathbb{Q}$. Then

$$M N_{i-1} N_i = N_{i-1} M N_i,$$

which implies that μ is not injective on L_t.

Example 18. Let $t \geq 1$ and let

$$N_1 = N_2 = \cdots = N_t = \begin{pmatrix} 3 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \; N_{t+1} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \; M = \begin{pmatrix} 3 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then for any $m_1, \ldots, m_t \geq 0$ we have

$$N_1 M^{m_1} N_2 M^{m_2} N_3 \ldots N_t M^{m_t} N_{t+1} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & E \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

where

$$E = 3^{m_1+\cdots+m_t+t} + 3^{m_1+\cdots+m_{t-1}+t-1} + \cdots + 3^{m_1+m_2+2} + 3^{m_1+1} + 1.$$

This implies that μ is injective on L_t.

6. Acknowledgement

The major part of this work was achieved when the first author was a member of the FiDiPro group of the FUNDIM research center at the University of Turku. The authors warmly thank Juhani Karhumäki and Luca Zamboni for their support.

References

[BHH$^+$08] P. Bell, V. Halava, T. Harju, J. Karhumäki, and I. Potapov. Matrix equations and Hilbert's tenth problem. *Internat. J. Algebra Comput.*, 18(8):1231–1241, 2008.

[CHK99] J. Cassaigne, T. Harju, and J. Karhumäki. On the undecidability of freeness of matrix semigroups. *Internat. J. Algebra Comput.*, 9(3-4):295–305, 1999. Dedicated to the memory of Marcel-Paul Schützenberger.

[CN12] J. Cassaigne and F. Nicolas. On the decidability of semigroup freeness. *RAIRO Theor. Inform. Appl.*, 46(3):355–399, 2012.

[Hon09] J. Honkala. Number systems and the injectivity problem for matrix representations of free monoids. *Internat. J. Algebra Comput.*, 19(2):229–233, 2009.

[KBS91] D. A. Klarner, J.-C. Birget, and W. Satterfield. On the undecidability of the freeness of integer matrix semigroups. *Internat. J. Algebra Comput.*, 1(2):223–226, 1991.

[KS86] W. Kuich and A. Salomaa. *Semirings, Automata, Languages*, volume 5 of *EATCS Monographs on Theoretical Computer Science*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1986.

[LT85] P. Lancaster and M. Tismenetsky. *The Theory of Matrices*. Computer Science and Applied Mathematics. Academic Press Inc., Orlando, FL, second edition, 1985.

[RS94] G. Rozenberg and A. Salomaa. *Cornerstones of Undecidability*. Prentice Hall, New York, 1994.

[SS78] A. Salomaa and M. Soittola. *Automata-Theoretic Aspects of Formal Power Series*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1978. Texts and Monographs in Computer Science.

(Émilie Charlier) INSTITUT DE MATHÉMATIQUES, UNIVERSITÉ DE LIÈGE, BELGIUM
E-mail address, Émilie Charlier: `echarlier@ulg.ac.be`

(Juha Honkala) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, UNIVERSITY OF TURKU, FINLAND
E-mail address, Juha Honkala: `juha.honkala@utu.fi`